

**MINUTES OF
CITY OF EDINA, MINNESOTA
TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
COMMUNITY ROOM
NOVEMBER 21, 2013
6:00 P.M.**

ROLL CALL Answering roll call was member Boettge, Franzen, Iyer, Janovy, LaForce, Nelson, Sierks, Spanhake, and Van Dyke.

APPROVAL OF MEETING AGENDA

Motion was made by member Franzen and seconded by member Janovy to approve the meeting agenda. All voted aye. Motion carried.

APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES

REGULAR MEETING OF OCTOBER 24, 2013 – Approved as corrected.

Motion was made by member LaForce and seconded by member Franzen to approve the amended minutes of October 24, 2013. All voted aye. Motion carried.

COMMUNITY COMMENT – None.

REPORTS/RECOMMENDATIONS

Promenade Phase 4

Mr. Ross Bintner, environmental engineer, presented the Edina Promenade Phase Conceptual Plan Outline and Narrative and asked for support for the plan from the ETC.

He explained that phase 4 is guided by the 2008 Promenade Plan and will include pedestrian, water and public art features. The project location is from Hazelton Rd to just north of the Centennial Lakes/Promenade connection. He said the water feature will include an underground robust water treatment feature that they are partnering with the Nine Mile Creek Watershed District on.

He said the plan was presented to the City Council this past Tuesday and to the watershed district this past Wednesday, and they have both approved it. It will be presented to other stakeholders in coming weeks. The total project cost is \$1.827M and construction is planned next summer.

Discussion by the ETC included closeness of building and shadow effect that could cause freeze/thaw (Centennial Lakes staff will perform maintenance); trail width will be 10-ft; dealing with conflicts at crossings (clear zones and stop signs, were suggested); and the flow of the water feature.

The consensus was that since the City Council has already approved the plan, the ETC would like staff to note the suggestions made and provide progress updates.

54th Street Reconstruction and Arden Park Stormwater Management Plan - Updates

Mr. Toby Muse, the City's consultant with SEH said last month he presented this project's draft feasibility study and is in attendance to answer questions regarding the updates that were submitted.

In reference to a variance, member LaForce asked for some examples of hardships and the likelihood that a variance would be approved. Mr. Muse said examples would be to design a specific curve that MnDOT requires or creating

unsafe sightline conditions because of a driveway. He was asked if any hardships exist and he said he is not aware of any.

In reference to raising the bridge, member Janovy said if it was a commercial development, the ETC would have been provided existing elevation, proposed elevation, etc. like is provided to the Planning Commission but in this case, no detail was provided that she can use to judge impacts to the road, shoreline, or intersection, though she assumed it is being designed to be safe. She said they don't have similar procedures for this structural change and since the ETC does not see the final design, they will not know how concerns are addressed. Mr. Muse said it is related to process and right now they are in the preliminary design phase and this level of detail is usually done in the final design phase.

Member Spanhake asked if there will be an opportunity for the community to be involved in the bridge design and Mr. Muse said yes. She asked what the impacts are with raising the bridge 3-ft. and Mr. Muse said the area will need to be regraded to allow proper drainage and add new retaining walls.

Member Janovy asked about bus stops and Mr. Muse said all bus stops will remain in the same locations, except for a few that is being removed; they will not have landing pads because landing pads are only required when new stops are being added.

Member Janovy asked if a 26-ft curb to curb street width was realistic and Mr. Muse said if it was being built without bike facility it would be 26-ft wide to meet State Aid requirements and also based on feedback to stay as narrow as possible. She said the bike plan does not require a bike facility on this road and her concern is that as lanes narrow, cyclists are squeezed and so placement of sharrows are important. Mr. Muse said MnDOT has specific guidelines regarding placement of sharrows. She said designing to minimum standards is the "safe" thing but it is not always the best thing to do and she is skeptical if this will improve conditions for cyclists. Planner Nolan said MnDOT, TLC and staff discussed adding the dash lines. Additionally, he believes having pavement markings helps to raise awareness that there could be cyclists on the road and having consistent treatment helps to improve conditions for them. He said further that this route was identified because it connects to the Minneapolis system.

Member Franzen asked if bike lane, sidewalk and two lanes of traffic are required by the Comp Plan and/or City Council and Mr. Muse said the bike facility was in the Comp Plan and this is why it is included. Member LaForce said he thought 54th was part of the TLC grant to connect to Minneapolis and asked if they are talking about removing the markings from 54th which would create a hole in the system and if this was an option. Planner Nolan and Mr. Muse said they believe TLC is okay with sharrows but if the markings are removed completely it is likely the City would have to give grant money back.

Member LaForce asked if they've received any feedback about the advisory lanes on 54th (east of France) and planner Nolan said no and they can only assume it is working because staff has not heard from anyone. Member LaForce said to add a third treatment that is different is going to be confusing and member Boettge concurred. Mr. Muse said this marking was recommended by TLC because it is better understood by both cyclists and drivers.

Member Janovy said the church sent a letter recently regarding their parking needs which is not limited to Sundays only. She is concerned about the extra width of the road for parking and providing parking in general for the church.

Community Comment

Mr. Gary Hanus, 5336 Brookview, said the following:

- In favor of sidewalk; however, 6-ft is excessive; would like it to be the City standard 5-ft. including the rumble strip; he is on the north side and his property is taking the brunt of the project.

Pam Starkey, 5331 Oaklawn Ave, said the following:

- Empathized with everyone and agreed that the north side is taking the brunt of project;
- Seen what happens on 50th with huge line of traffic and traffic will move to 54th with nice, smooth roads so 13-ft seem reasonable;
- Not sure why there is a big push for bike lanes; she would just as soon ride in the street and follow traffic rules; do not add another 1-ft to the road;
- Keep it in proportion to the neighborhood.

John Adams, 5336 W. 54th, said the following:

- So many moving parts – State Aid road, secondary bike facility, etc.
- Put yourself in his shoe and review the context of his street – 7-ft. parking, 12-ft. driving lanes;
- Traffic speed issues as it exist today;
- Parking will be closer to his dining room;
- Most discriminated section of the proposal;
- Does not believe anyone supports road widening;
- Church that needs parking;
- Neighbors having to defend their own interest;
- Take away bike designation and everyone would support 13-ft lane, 5-ft. sidewalk, 7 day a week parking on both sides and same design across the bridge;

Mark Eppele, 5336 Kellogg, said the following:

- Speaking for the west end side – all corner lots with a 15-ft. setback requirement, average housing age is 71, and several with non-conforming setback; concerned about the project coming any closer;
- Wants project centered and do not touch utility poles;
- Have made several attempts to find out from the consultant where the utility poles are located and to no avail;
- Make sidewalk 5-ft (no boulevard);

Mr. Steve Timmer, 5448 Oaklawn Ave, said the following:

- Against raising bridge 3-ft. because it changes sightline, approaches and is expensive;
- Could reduce road width by 2-ft based on Wooddale's example which he measured;

Lori Grotz, 5513 Park Pl, said the following:

- The streets in her neighborhood were reconstructed two years ago;
- The intersection at Park Pl is wide and dangerous; the proposed plans has it narrower; now that it is paid for they want to make it smaller; retaining wall is more dangerous;
- Spending too much money so canoeists can go under the bridge; concerned about crime under the bridge;
- Would like Park Pl to stay wide and bridge stay low.

Ed Ross, 4015 W. 54th, said the following:

- Supports comments John made;
- Supports comments Pam made about biking;
- Jumping through hoops and paying a price for bike lanes;
- Church needs more parking;
- Counted bikes and only 9 in 90 minutes on a Sunday; 4 or 5 during the week;
- Pay the TLC money back and get rid of bike lanes.

Kathryn Green, 5400 Kellogg Ave, said the following:

- Residents are focused on keeping streets narrow for safety, maintain charm and property values;
- Residents working to be one voice and to prioritize what the needs are;

- Understands that streets has to be livable, safe to walk;
- Make them livable but in a responsible fashion and not only for the people who use the streets occasionally.

Member Janovy asked Mr. Muse about the utility poles and he said State Aid requires a 2-ft clear zone which is shown in the graphic. He said it does not meet this today but all rules must be adhered to since they are reconstructing the road.

For clarification on Wooddale lane width, chair Nelson said Wooddale was only restriped within the last two years, not reconstructed, and he is not sure what the rule was then.

Member Spanhake asked if the sidewalk could be 4-ft with a 1-ft rumble strip. Yes, this would meet the requirement but Public Works prefers a 5-ft sidewalk with a 1-ft boulevard or rumble strip so they'll have a place to store snow instead of pushing it in the street. She asked if it could be a different width if not maintained by the City. Yes.

Chair Nelson asked if there are other material treatments other than a concrete rumble strip and Mr. Muse said there are several options but they have decided on one yet. Chair Nelson stated that he feels that having no boulevard is acceptable.

Member Boettge asked if the residents would prefer maintaining the sidewalk themselves.

Member LaForce said it sounds like the residents would like to see a different plan and asked if the plan was representative of wider feedback. Mr. Muse said the 54th St residents are in attendance but the plan was developed based on the aggregate feedback (including over 700 participants) to keep street as narrow as possible.

Motion was made by member Janovy to recommend the following to the City Council – from France Ave west to the bridge: 7-foot striped parking lane on the north side, two 11-foot travel lanes (no centerline stripe), 7-foot striped parking lane on the south side; do not raise the bridge and include a 6-ft sidewalk on both sides of the bridge; from the bridge west to Wooddale Ave: two 13-foot (11 ft + 2 ft reaction) unstriped travel lanes; and a 6-ft (5-ft plus 1-ft rumble strip)sidewalk on the north side from Wooddale Ave to France Ave. The motion was seconded by member LaForce.

Ayes: Boettge, Franzen, Janovy, LaForce, Spanhake

Nay: Nelson

Abstain: Iyer

Motion carried.

2014 Neighborhood Reconstruction Projects – Updates

Planner Nolan said interim city engineer Millner prepared updates included the following:

Morningside B

Staff met with residents regarding the 42nd St and Grimes Ave sidewalks; speed and volume data were submitted and they will continue to monitor the area west of Grimes Ave. For the 42nd St sidewalk, staff is recommending the north side of the street to the City limits. Planner Nolan said additional surveying was done and they found more conflicts on the south side including less right-of-way.

Birchcrest B

Updated traffic counts were provided.

Community Comment

Wayne Lindholm, 5024 Valley View Rd, said the following:

- Reiterated what he said at the ETC's Oct. 24 meeting regarding streetlights and sidewalk survey results.
- On Oct. 24, he asked why staff decided to move forward with the sidewalk and not streetlights even though most were not in favor of sidewalk and Director Houle said he would check with staff and he is still waiting for a response.
- ETC was misinformed that there was overwhelming support for the sidewalk; he attended the neighborhood sidewalk meeting and residents were not asked their preference for sidewalk; much of the discussion centered on traffic, parking and some talk about the sidewalk.
- Petition walked around and it was 2/3 against and 1/3 for the sidewalk.
- Odd that it was passed forward with an open issue on the table and he would like to know why.

Art Thelemann, 5132 Valley View Rd, said the following:

- Ask to have the minutes corrected to show correct spelling of his last name and that he opposed the sidewalk;
- He's read everything that he could find, including Council Connection that talked about the Living Street Policy and he is curious how they are moving forward with it when the implementation plan is not yet developed.
- He cross-referenced the survey results with those who attended the sidewalk meeting and 10 of the 17 families said no to the sidewalk; this is not support for the sidewalk;
- Difficult to access information on the website – still looking for the difference between local and collector streets.
- Biased against the residents.

Member Janovy motioned to amend the October 24 minutes as requested by Mr. Thelemann and the motion was seconded by member Iyer. All voted aye. Motion carried.

Traffic Safety Committee Report of November 6, 2013

Section C: member Janovy said as part of the Grandview CAT, economic development manager Neuendorf has engaged Kimley Horn to do a traffic study and she recommended that planner Nolan connect with him.

Section D-2: After discussion, it was decided that this would be removed for clarification of the location.

Motion was made by member Janovy and seconded by member Iyer to forward the November 6 Traffic Safety Report to City Council without Section D-2. All voted aye. Motion carried.

Updates

Student Members - None

Bike Edina Task Force

Member Janovy reported that Quality Bicycle Products had a mini-bike summit with the cities of Edina, Bloomington and Richfield and another one is planned for January. The consultant that is developing Hennepin County's bike plan was in attendance and they are seeking input via an online survey. Planner Nolan said he is on the policy advisory committee.

Living Streets Working Group

Planner Nolan said they are working with Feed the Dog on branding and developing a public relations campaign. He said they are looking for feedback on the sample logos and tag lines that were handed out and are also looking for people in the community to champion the cause and help move it forward. Feedback included:

- Likes the "e" but it may not have a long shelf life and people may not understand the tagline;

- Not crazy about taglines and is not sure about branding Living Streets; opponents might consider it social engineering; put energy into why sidewalks are needed, etc;
- Will people understand what Living Streets mean? Spend time on more factual things that will inform;
- Cars are not represented in the logo examples; concerned that it looks like all modes are on the same path in the second example; do not like “All” at the end of “Our Streets Connect Us All,” suggested ‘Connected, Safer, Healthier’ as a tagline;

Communications Committee - None

CORRESPONDENCE AND PETITIONS - None

CHAIR AND COMMISSION MEMBER COMMENTS

Member LaForce said after tonight’s discussion of 54th St, he is thinking about something that member Iyer has pushed for and that is to identify a plan and criteria because tonight the ETC is asking the City Council to create a hole in its bike plan by recommending that the City Council not approve bike lanes on 54th St. He said he is not feeling good about this but it seemed they did not have any substantive reasons or a plan to back up what they were doing. He said when they change their minds or do things differently it causes them to miss an opportunity for many years. He said this is an important east/west corridor for bikes, pedestrians and cars and they are recommending not doing anything.

Member Franzen added that tonight’s discussion exposed the big hole in the plan. He said while it is great to want bike facilities everywhere, there isn’t enough room on 54th St for a nice facility and sidewalk and meet State Aid rules. He said they should first look at the corridors to be sure there is enough room or right-of-way.

Member Janovy added that the plan as proposed did not do enough for cycling. She said the rules of the road are the same whether you have shared lane markings or not and bikers will be riding in the same place whether there are markings or not. She said it has become increasingly important to her that when they put in bike facility that it is the kind that increases comfort and this is dedicated space. She said using sharrows for brief sections to make a connection is fine but the concept of sharrows as the treatment has less function.

Member Spanhake suggested having a debriefing on the engagement process to see what was learned because she understood the bike lane was a given and now they are recommending taking them out. She liked the idea of the engagement process but it came down to listening to those who disagreed and making changes based on this. She said she valued the engineering work and preliminary design that are already done but they should look at the process so they do not make the same mistakes again.

Member Spanhake said she can get printed copies of the Bike and Pedestrian Best Practices handout (from MnDOT) if everyone is interested. She will get enough for everyone.

Member Iyer said the ETC does not get feedback after projects are completed. He said residents do not like projects in the beginning but it would be nice to follow up to see if changed their minds after the project is completed. He concurred with member Janovy and said the bike markings should be removed. He said they should only add dedicated bike lanes. Member Boettge *added that the bike markings did not live up to her expectation.*

Chair Nelson said the City received a Commuter Choice Award. He said he attended a Metro Transit planning session at Southdale and they are seeking feedback online as part of their transit service improvement to identify where bus services are needed.

STAFF COMMENTS

Updates from Mr. Nolan:

- France Ave intersections improvement was re-bid on Nov. 20 and the low bid was \$3M; it will be recommended for approval.
- Hazelton Rd project will bid in January.
- The County is still planning on striping the Vernon Ave bike lane next week.
- Xerxes Ave striping and temporary bump-outs were completed last week. A left turn lane was added without signage that created confusion; the County will be adding signage.
- 3 sidewalk projects were submitted for funding from Hennepin County and two were approved. They are York Ave from 66th to the transit station, \$8,000; and Vernon Ave from Doncaster to Ayshire, \$50,000; staff has three years to complete these projects.
- How do members feel about getting their packets electronically and accessing them on I:Legislate? Feedback was since not everyone has an iPad could the City provide them for the meetings? Can you mark up the electronic copy? The screen would need to be big since they look at plans in different sizes.

ADJOURNMENT

Meeting adjourned.

ATTENDANCE

TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION ATTENDANCE - 2013																
NAME	TERM	J	F	M	A	M	J	J	A	S	O	N	D	Work Session	# of Mtgs	Attendance %
Meetings/Work Sessions		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1		1	12	
														7/16		
Bass, Katherine	2/1/2014		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1		1	10	83%
Boettge, Emily	2/1/2014								1	1	1	1			4	100%
Braden, Ann*	2/1/2014	1	1		1	1	1								5	42%
Franzen, Nathan	2/1/2016	1	1		1	1			1	1	1	1		1	9	75%
Iyer, Surya	2/1/2015	1	1	1		1	1	1		1		1		1	9	75%
Janovy, Jennifer	2/1/2014	1	1	1	1	1	1	1		1	1	1		1	11	92%
LaForce, Tom	2/1/2015	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1		1	12	100%
Nelson, Paul	2/1/2016	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1		1	12	100%
Schweiger, Steven	student	1	1			1									3	25%
Sierks, Caroline	student	1		1	1	1	1		1	1	1	1			9	75%
Spanhake, Dawn	2/1/2016			1		1	1		1	1	1	1			7	70%
Van Dyke, Jackson	student									1	1	1			3	100%
Whited, Courtney	2/1/2015	1	1	1	1	1		1	1	1	1			1	10	83%